

REMARKS

Claims 20-22 and 31-39 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 20 and 37 have been amended and Claims 23, 24, 40, and 41 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20-23 and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson (GB 2235780).

Claims 20, 22, 23, and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson (GB 2235780) in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Number 3,343,151) and further in view of Hamerski et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,507,464)..

Claims 24 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson as applied to Claims 20 and 37 above, and further in view of Heagle et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,939,974) or Kail (U.S. Patent Number 5,959,529).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot with respect to independent Claims 20 and 37, as independent Claims 20 and 37 have been cancelled

without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Because Claims 20-22 and 37-39 now depend from allowable independent Claim 31, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 20-22 and 37-39 is similarly moot. Accordingly, consideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 20-24 and 37-41 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,378,315.

Claims 20, 22, 23, 24, and 37-41 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,918 in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Number 3,343,151) and further in view of Hamerski et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,507,464).

At the outset, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot with respect to Claims 23, 24, 40, and 41, as Claims 23, 24, 40, and 41 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Further, Claims 20-22 and 37-39 have been amended to depend from an allowed claim and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 31-36 are allowed. Because Applicants have amended Claims 20-22 and Claims 37-39 to depend from allowable independent Claim 31, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 20-22 and 37-39 are similarly in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 10, 2006

By: 

Michael Malinzak
Reg. No. 43,770
Matthew H. Szalach
Reg. No. 53,665

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM/MHS/pal